

Cooperative Marketing Summary

for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2016



Working together to lead Missouri in becoming one of America's most memorable tourist destinations.

Published January 2017 for the FY2016 program year -- July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016

SECTION I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Missouri Division of Tourism's (MDT) Cooperative Marketing Programs include the Promote Missouri Fund (PMF) and the SEM Partnership. The PMF has awarded over \$58 million toward the support of local performance-based tourism marketing projects since its inception in fiscal year 1995. The PMF is separated into three distinct programs: Marketing Matching Grant, Marketing Platform Development and Collective Marketing Initiative.

Cooperative Marketing Goals:

- Support and further the Missouri Division of Tourism's overall annual marketing strategy as outlined in the annual marketing plan and position Missouri to compete more effectively for travel and tourism market share during the next decade.
- Create programs based on the common marketing goals of MDT and its Destination Marketing Organizations (DMO), thereby creating mutually beneficial marketing executions.
- Create a program that is efficient to implement for both MDT and its partners.

Administration:

MDT administers the PMF on behalf of the Missouri Tourism Commission, which reserves the right to make all final decisions. MDT partners with both Madden Media and H&L Partners to administer the Cooperative Marketing Programs.

Promote Missouri Fund Advisory Committee:

The advisory committee, comprised of ten tourism industry professionals representing each of the five regions of the state, provides valuable customer input about program design and administration of the program.

Promote Missouri Fund Opportunities:

- **Marketing Matching Grant** – The Marketing Matching Grant (MMG) is a 50/50 matching program for preapproved leisure travel advertising completed in preapproved media markets. Project reporting and reimbursement requests are due quarterly with a final Project Summary Report due at the end of the fiscal year. Award amounts are based on the County Tourism Level (CTL) of the certified DMOs.
- **Marketing Platform Development** – The Marketing Platform Development (MPD) is a 50/50 matching program for a one-time, preapproved marketing investment that will be utilized beyond the fiscal year of the initial investment. The Project Summary Report and reimbursement request is due at the end of the project. This grant is specifically for DMOs with a CTL of 4 or less and can also be utilized by regional partnerships. Each individual grant has a cap of \$5,000 in matching funds.
- **Collective Marketing Initiative** – The Collective Marketing Initiative (CMI), while not a matching grant, leverages the resources of MDT through a broad menu of subsidized print and digital marketing opportunities. The major benefits to the DMOs include strength through a unified message, better ad positioning, media outlets with increased

reach, potential to run larger ad sizes and the obvious financial savings. The program opportunities are selected based on their ability to effectively and efficiently reach Missouri's target customers. CMI participants pay the vendor directly and reporting is not required for the program; the program is open to DMOs as well as other tourism industry organizations.

Search Engine Marketing Partnership:

The Search Engine Marketing (SEM) Partnership is not located under the umbrella of the PMF; however, it is a dynamic and powerful cooperative marketing tool. The program allows DMOs to send a steady stream of qualified traffic to their website. The unified effort drives traffic to their site without competing with the state or other Missouri participants. The program is a 50/50 match with minimums/maximuns and various budget levels. SEM participants pay Madden Media directly and reporting is not required for the program.

SECTION II. FY2016 COOPERATIVE MARKETING ANALYSIS

FY2016 Analysis:

MDT approved 30 tourism marketing projects in the matching grant programs and the awards totaled approximately \$2.7 million. Also, MDT had a CMI investment of more than \$315,000 and SEM investments of almost \$236,000. The MDT and partners' combined investments led to a \$6.5 million budget for local industry partners to market their destinations.

Upon completion of each matching grant project, participants submit summary reports assessing the outcome of the funded marketing activities. The following pages contain an analysis of participant-provided statistical data for program-wide measurement.

The MMG dollars purchased media advertising which includes television, magazines, radio, inserts, billboards and digital marketing. In-state marketing accounted for 20 percent of the budget, with the remaining 80 percent focused on the out-of-state market.

Figure 1 details the dollars that were made available and the actual dollars expended for FY2016 advertising and marketing activities in each the programs. This figure includes both MDT and DMO contributions.

Figure 1

FY16 Summary of Cooperative Marketing Investments

<u>Marketing Category</u>	<u>Participating Organizations</u>	<u>Awarded Amount</u>	<u>MDT Contribution</u>	<u>DMO Contribution</u>
Marketing Matching Grant	24	\$2,739,401	\$2,635,798	\$2,816,236
Marketing Platform Development	6	\$21,850	\$19,138	\$19,338
Collective Marketing Initiative	22	N/A	\$315,936	\$276,893

Cooperative Marketing Summary | 2016

Search Engine Marketing	17	N/A	\$235,987	\$235,987
Totals	35	\$2,761,251	\$3,206,859	\$3,348,454

STATISTICAL DATA:

Outcomes for Marketing Matching Grant:

More than 80 percent of the cooperative marketing dollars were used for projects in the MMG – this amount continues to be fairly consistent year to year within the programs. The summary report outlines the project's objectives as well as the DMO's measure of success for the funded project. The participants provide the main objectives of the project, gauge the extent to which the objectives were met and comment on the degree of success attributed to the project. These comments can be found in the "Individual Projects" section of this report.

Participants provide measurement research to support the reported outcomes. The level of research required for each project is commensurate with the CTL and the amount of state funding provided. This research provides not only important data, but also valuable insight into Missouri tourism marketing trends at the local level.

Figure 2 summarizes dollars awarded and reimbursed for the MMG program by DMO and county designation. This figure shows contributions by MDT only.

Figure 2

<u>DMO Name</u>	<u>County Designations</u>	<u>Awarded</u>	<u>Reimbursed</u>
Branson/Lakes Area Chamber /CVB	Taney	\$415,000	\$415,000
St. Louis CVC	St. Louis/St. Louis City	\$415,000	\$415,000
Visit KC	Jackson	\$415,000	\$362,151
Springfield CVB	Christina/Greene/Polk	\$400,000	\$400,000
Table Rock Lake/Kimberling City Chamber	Stone	\$200,000	\$199,885
Lake of the Ozarks Tri-County Lodging	Camden/Miller/Morgan	\$200,000	\$191,212
City of St. Charles Tourism Department	St. Charles	\$199,725	\$198,597
City of Columbia CVB	Boone	\$82,265	\$75,599
Platte County Visitors Bureau	Platte	\$77,780	\$58,482
Buchanan County Tourism Board	Buchanan	\$45,000	\$45,000
Carthage CVB	Jasper	\$45,000	\$45,000
City of Hannibal CVB	Marion/Ralls	\$45,000	\$45,000
Pulaski County Visitors Bureau	Pulaski	\$36,730	\$34,094
Cape Girardeau Chamber/CVB	Cape Girardeau	\$36,289	\$29,750
City of Lebanon	Laclede	\$31,543	\$30,536
Jefferson City CVB	Cole	\$22,492	\$22,491
City of Sikeston d/b/a Sikeston CVB	Scott	\$20,000	\$20,000
Washington Area Chamber of Commerce	Franklin	\$12,740	\$12,740
Clinton Tourism Association, Inc	Henry	\$11,891	\$8,942

Cooperative Marketing Summary | 2016

Moberly Area Chamber of Commerce	Randolph	\$8,000	\$8,000
Sedalia Convention & Visitors Bureau	Pettis	\$6,786	\$6,731
City of West Plains Tourism Development	Howell	\$5,160	\$4,623
City of Boonville Tourism Department	Cooper	\$4,000	\$2,965
City of Ste. Genevieve Tourism Department	Ste. Genevieve	\$4,000	\$4,000
Totals		\$2,739,401	\$2,635,798

Figure 3 summarizes the number of ads placed within the MMG program by media type. This figure shows contributions by both MDT and DMOs.

Figure 3

<u>Media Type</u>	<u>Number of Ads</u>	<u>Amount Invested</u>	<u>Percent of MMG</u>
Television	29,350	\$2,801,510	51%
Digital	181	\$1,218,372	22%
Print	248	\$719,771	13%
Radio	10,828	\$290,137	6%
SEM	30	\$284,131	5%
Billboards	20	\$138,113	3%
Totals	40,657	\$5,452,034	100%

Outcomes for Marketing Platform Development:

In FY2016, the MPD program represented less than 1 percent of the total PMF appropriations with six participants. These funds are available to certified and non-certified DMOs with a CTL of four or lower. Each grant is not to exceed \$5,000 and can only be used for a one-time platform investment.

Figure 4 summarizes dollars awarded and reimbursed for the MPD program by DMO and county designation. This figure shows contributions by MDT only.

Figure 4

<u>DMO Name</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Awards</u>	<u>Reimbursements</u>
City of Eminence	Shannon	\$5,000	\$3,700
City of Ste. Genevieve Tourism Dept	Ste. Genevieve	\$5,000	\$5,000
Old Trails Regional Partnership	Lafayette	\$4,800	\$4,800
Carthage CVB	Jasper	\$3,150	\$1,738
Kennett Chamber of Commerce	Dunklin	\$2,500	\$2,500
Monett Chamber of Commerce	Barry	\$1,400	\$1,400
Totals		\$21,850	\$19,138

Outcomes for the Collective Marketing Initiative:

The CMI menu of subsidized print and digital marketing choices offer MDT partners the opportunity to purchase advertising as a unified entity. Public and private entities were eligible to participate with preference first given to certified DMOs, then non-certified DMOs and industry partners. A total of 22 partners participated and MDT supported the effort with a \$315,000 investment.

The major benefits to the DMOs included strength through a unified message, better ad positioning, media outlets with increased reach, potential to run larger ad sizes and financial savings.

Figure 5 summarizes the total dollars invested by MDT in CMI and the DMO/organization (and the county designation) that participated. This figure shows the total amount contributed by MDT only.

Figure 5

<u>DMO/Organization Name</u>	<u>County</u>
Branson Lakes Area COC/CVB	Taney
Cape Girardeau CVB	Cape Girardeau
Chateau on the Lake	Taney
Fulton/Callaway County	Callaway
Hannibal CVB	Marion/Ralls
Independence Tourism Dept	Jackson
Jefferson City CVB	Cole
Joplin CVB	Jasper
Lake of the Ozarks Tri-County Lodging	Camden/Miller/Morgan
MO State Parks	Multiple
Moberly Area Chamber of Commerce	Randolph
Old Trails	Lafayette
Pulaski County Visitors Bureau	Pulaski
Sedalia Area Chamber/CVB	Pettis
Sikeston CVB	Scott
Silver Dollar City	Stone
Springfield CVB	Christian/Greene/Polk
St. Charles CVB	St. Charles
St. Joseph CVB	Buchanan
St. Louis CVC	St. Louis/St. Louis City
City of Ste. Genevieve Tourism Dept	Ste. Genevieve
Washington Area Chamber	Franklin
Totals	\$315,936

Outcomes for the Search Engine Marketing Partnership:

The SEM Partnership is available to both certified and non-certified DMOs in the state. The program is provided through MDT's partner, Madden Media. In FY16, 17 DMOs participated.

Figure 6 summarizes the total dollars invested by MDT in SEM and the DMO/organization (and the county designation) that participated. This figure shows the total amount contributed by MDT only.

Figure 6

DMO/Organization Name	County
Branson Lakes Area COC/CVB	Taney
Cape Girardeau CVB	Cape Girardeau
City of Lebanon	Laclede
Clinton Chamber of Commerce	Henry
Hannibal CVB	Marion/Ralls
Hermann City Hall - Tourism	Gasconade
Independence Tourism Dept	Jackson
Jefferson City CVB	Cole
Joplin CVB	Jasper
Lake of the Ozarks Tri-County Lodging	Camden/Miller/Morgan
Pulaski County Tourism Bureau	Pulaski
Sedalia Area Chamber/CVB	Pettis
St. Charles CVB	St. Charles
St. Joseph CVB	Buchanan
City of Ste. Genevieve Tourism Dept	Ste. Genevieve
Visit KC	Jackson
Washington Area Chamber	Franklin
Totals	\$235,987

SECTION III. FY2016 ASSESSMENTS - INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

The following pages reflect the outcome information provided by the participants for each individual FY2016 contract for the MMG.